

A. REMARKS

No amendments to the application have been made in this reply. Hence, Claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-24 and 26-31 are pending in this application. All issues raised in the final Office Action mailed April 5, 2004 are addressed hereinafter. In view of the comments provided hereinafter, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the final Office Action mailed on April 5, 2004.

SUMMARY OF FINAL OFFICE ACTION

The issues raised in the final Office Action mailed on April 5, 2004 are summarized below. Each of these issues is discussed hereinafter.

1. Rejections based on a combination of references under 35 U.S.C. § 103 cannot be overcome by attacking references individually.
2. The Optical Discs of *Moon et al.*, U.S. Patent 6,408,338 (hereinafter "*Moon*") are WORM storage Devices as recited in the Claims.
3. Claims 1-3, 8-13, 18-23 and 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ramsay et al.*, U.S. Patent 5,502,576 (hereinafter "*Ramsay*") in view of *Moon*.
4. Claims 4, 6, 7, 14, 16, 17, 24, 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ramsay* in view of *Moon* and further in view of *Kern*, U.S. Patent 6,202,124 (hereinafter "*Kern*").

1. REJECTIONS BASED ON A COMBINATION OF REFERENCES UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 CANNOT BE OVERCOME BY ATTACKING REFERENCES INDIVIDUALLY

In the final Office Action, the Examiner asserted that the Applicant attacked the references individually and only argued the *Moon* reference in an effort to overcome the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicant respectfully submits that all arguments in previous responses properly addressed all references in combination, at least to the extent that the references were relied upon in previous Office Actions. The prior Office Action mailed on October 14, 2003 admitted that *Ramsay* does not “explicitly teach process a search query against the digital data stored on the WORM storage device, generate data that identifies data stored on the WORM storage device that satisfies the search query” (final Office Action mailed April 5, 2004 page 6) and relied upon only the *Moon* reference for these limitations. The reply filed on January 14, 2004 acknowledged the position in the Office Action mailed on October 14, 2003 that the *Ramsay* reference did not teach or suggest the aforementioned limitation and that only the *Moon* reference was being relied upon for this limitation. Accordingly, this reply addressed only the *Moon* reference with respect to this limitation. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the reply filed on January 14, 2004 properly addressed both the *Ramsay* and *Moon* references in combination with respect to the aforementioned limitation.

2. THE OPTICAL DISCS OF MOON ARE WORM STORAGE DEVICES AS RECITED IN THE CLAIMS

The Examiner has asserted that *Moon* teaches processing a search query against digital data stored on optical discs, that all optical discs are WORM media and that the Claim 1 limitation of “process[ing] a search query against the digital data stored on the WORM storage

device” is therefore taught by *Moon*. The Examiner relies on the Microsoft Computer Dictionary definition of the term WORM which is defined as “a type of optical disc that can be read and reread, but cannot be altered after it has been recorded.”

A WORM device can be any type of media to which data can be written to only a single time and read multiple times. The write-once read-many property of WORM devices is not limited to optical discs, as suggested by the excerpt from the Microsoft Computer Dictionary provided by the Examiner. For example, WORM devices may be implemented using magnetic media. Furthermore, not all optical discs are necessarily WORM devices. For example, rewritable compact discs (CDs) and rewritable digital versatile discs (DVDs) are two types of optical discs that are in widespread use and are not WORM devices, since data can be rewritten to them many times. It is the special properties of a WORM storage device that distinguishes it from other storage devices.

In view of the special limitations and properties of a WORM device, in the absence of some teaching or suggestion that the optical discs of *Moon* are WORM devices, or at least are not of the rewritable variety, it cannot fairly be said that the optical discs described in *Moon* are WORM devices, since they could just as easily be rewritable optical discs. It is therefore respectfully submitted that *Moon* does not teach or suggest processing a search query against digital data stored on a WORM device as recited in Claim 1.

3. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-3, 8-13, 18-23 AND 28-31 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the final Office Action, Claims 1-3, 8-13, 18-23 and 28-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by *Ramsey* in view of *Moon*. It is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-3, 8-13, 18-23 and 28-31 are patentable over *Ramsey* and *Moon* for at least the reason provided hereinafter.